arXiv:1410.8098v2 [math.AP] 30 Nov 2015

STABILITY OF INVERSE PROBLEMS IN AN INFINITE SLAB WITH PARTIAL DATA

PEDRO CARO AND KALOYAN MARINOV

Abstract. In this paper, we study the stability of two inverse boundary value problems in an infinite slab with partial data. These problems have been studied by Li and Uhlmann in [28] for the case of the Schrödinger equation and by Krupchyk, Lassas and Uhlmann in [26] for the case of the magnetic Scrödinger equation. Here we quantify the method of uniqueness proposed by Li and Uhlmann and prove a log-log stability estimate for the inverse problems associated to the Schrödinger equation. The boundary measurements considered in these problems are modelled by partial knowledge of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map: in the first inverse problem, the corresponding Dirichlet and Neumann data are known on different boundary hyperplanes of the slab; in the second inverse problem, they are known on the same boundary hyperplane of the slab.

1. Introduction

This paper is devoted to the study of an inverse boundary value problem (IBVP) for the Schrödinger equation in an infinite slab. The problem consists of recovering the electric potential q in the slab

$$\Sigma := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 < x_3 < L\},$$

from partial knowledge of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map (DN map). Here, $L > 0$ is a constant, x_3 denotes the 3rd coordinate of x and q is compactly supported in

$$Q := \{(x', x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x'| \leq R,\, 0 \leq x_3 \leq L\}$$

with $R > 0$ a constant. The DN map is roughly defined by

$$\Lambda_q : f \longmapsto \partial_\nu u|_{\partial\Sigma},$$

where $\partial\Sigma$ denotes the boundary of Σ, ν represents the outward-pointing unit normal vector along $\partial\Sigma$, $\partial_\nu = \nu \cdot \nabla$ and u solves the problem[1]

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta - k^2 + q)u = 0 \text{ in } \Sigma \\ u|_{\partial\Sigma} = f. \end{cases}$$

Key words and phrases. Inverse boundary problems; partial data; stability.

[1]This problem is well-posed under certain conditions on f, k and q but, for the sake of simplicity, we omit details at this point.

In [28], Li and Uhlmann proved two uniqueness results for the potential q; each result assumes a different kind of partial knowledge of the DN map. In order to precisely describe these uniqueness results, we need to introduce some notation. The boundary of Σ consists of the two hyperplanes

$$\Gamma_1 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 = L\}, \qquad \Gamma_2 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 = 0\}.$$

Choose $R' > 0$ with $R < R'$, and set

$$\Gamma_j^N := \{x \in \Gamma_j : |x'| < R'\}, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Let Γ_1^D be a relatively open, precompact subset of Γ_1 such that

$$\overline{\Gamma_1^N} \subset \Gamma_1^D.$$

Let q_1 and q_2 be potentials from $L^\infty(\Sigma)$ such that both are (compactly) supported in Q, and let Λ_{q_1} and Λ_{q_2} denote their corresponding DN maps. Li and Uhlamann showed that if either

$$\Lambda_{q_1} f|_{\Gamma_1^N} = \Lambda_{q_2} f|_{\Gamma_1^N}$$

for all f supported in $\overline{\Gamma_1^D}$, or

$$\Lambda_{q_1} f|_{\Gamma_2^N} = \Lambda_{q_2} f|_{\Gamma_2^N}$$

for all f supported in $\overline{\Gamma_1^D}$, then

$$q_1 = q_2.$$

These results were extended by Krupchyk, Lassas and Uhlmann in [26] to the case of the magnetic Scrödinger equation. In a slightly different situation (see [33]), Pohjola has been able to relax the assumptions on the region where the boundary data is measured.

In the last fifteen years, IBVPs with partial data have attracted a lot of attention and nowadays there is a fairly long list of publications studying such problems. In [5], Bukhgeim and Uhlmann established, in dimension $n \geq 3$, uniqueness results for the IBVPs associated to the Schrödinger equation and the conductivity equation in the setting where the Dirichlet data is given on the whole boundary but the Neumann data is given only on (roughly speaking) half of the boundary. This result was improved by Kenig, Sjöstrand and Uhlmann in [27]. Stability estimates for these problems have been established in [20] for the Bukhgeim and Uhlmann's result and in [8] and [9] for the Kenig *et al*'s result. It is important to point out that, so far, the best known stability for these problems is of log-log type. A partial reconstruction procedure was proposed by Nachman and Street in [31]. Other related results are [15], [11], [35], [12], [14], [34] and [13]. Another important result with partial data is [24], where Isakov proved, in dimension $n = 3$, uniqueness for IBVPs associated to the Schrödinger equation and the conductivity equation with partial data. In his paper, Isakov assumed the boundary of the domain to be partially flat or spherical and the

measurements to be taken on the complement of the flat or spherical part. Wang and Heck proved in [21] that Isakov's method provides the optimal stability for this inverse problem, that is, of log type (see [30] in connection with the optimality issue). Related results are [6], [7], [26] and [29]. Other interesting results for IBVPs with partial data are [3], [22] [18], [25], [2], [4] and [16].

The basic tools to deal with this kind of partial-data IBVPs are integration by parts to obtain Alessandrini formulas and the construction of appropriate complex geometric optics (CGOs). In [5], Bukhgeim and Uhlmann used a Carleman estimate with boundary terms to control the part of the boundary where no measurements were taken and then stated a type of Alessandrini formula. On the other hand, in [24], Isakov used a reflection argument across the flat part of the domain's boundary to construct CGOs vanishing on that flat part. In [28], Li and Uhlmann took advantage of the geometry of the slab to combine the ideas from [5] and [24] to prove their uniqueness results.

The main results in this paper are quantitative versions of Li and Uhlmann's results and will be stated in Section 2. They consist of log-log-type stability estimates for the IBVPs under consideration. In order to explain the reason for the extra log in our estimate, we will now sketch the main points in our proof for the case where the Dirichlet and Neumann data are measured on different hyperplanes.

Let q_1 and q_2 denote two potentials with compact support in Q, and let $\Lambda^2_{q_1}$ and $\Lambda^2_{q_2}$ be defined by

$$\Lambda^2_{q_1} f = \Lambda_{q_1} f|_{\Gamma_2^N}, \qquad \Lambda^2_{q_2} f = \Lambda_{q_2} f|_{\Gamma_2^N},$$

for all f supported in $\overline{\Gamma_1^D}$. The first step in our approach is to prove an integral estimate in which

$$\left| \int_\Sigma (q_1 - q_2) u_1 u_2 \, dx \right|$$

is bounded by $\|\Lambda^2_{q_1} - \Lambda^2_{q_2}\|_*$ plus some controllable terms, for a large enough set of functions u_1 and u_2 solving the equations $(-\Delta - k^2 + q_1)u_1 = 0$ and $(-\Delta - k^2 + q_2)u_2 = 0$ in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \Sigma$ satisfying

$$\{x \in \Sigma : |x'| \leq R\} \subset \Omega.$$

In order to obtain this estimate, we require u_1 to vanish along $\Gamma_2 \cap \partial\Omega$. The second step in our approach is to construct an appropriate family of solutions to extract information from the integral estimate. This will be a family of CGOs depending on a large parameter τ. In order to ensure that u_1 meets the requisite condition $u_1|_{\Gamma_2 \cap \partial\Omega} = 0$, we will use Isakov's reflection argument from [24]. The third step is to insert the CGOs into the integral estimate, which enables us to estimate (from

above) the Fourier transform of $q_1 - q_2$ at frequencies from

$$\{\xi = (\xi', \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\xi| < r,\ |\xi'| > 1\}$$

in terms of $\|\Lambda^2_{q_2} - \Lambda^2_{q_1}\|_*$ and the parameter τ. The forth step consists of extending the set of frequencies, at which the Fourier transform of $q_1 - q_2$ is controlled, to all of $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\xi| < r\}$. To do so, we proceed as Liang did in [29]: we use that the Fourier transform of $q_1 - q_2$ is analytic and a result from [23]. Thus, we are able to control all the low frequencies in a ball of arbitrary radius. Finally, we follow the ideas proposed by Alessandrini in [1] to control first $\|q_1 - q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ and then $\|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)}$.

The ingredients to achieve the first step are a Carleman estimate with boundary terms (proved and used in [5] by Bukhgeim and Uhlmann), a quantified unique continuation property from a proper boundary subset (due to Phung, see [32]), and a Runge-type approximation argument (performed by Li and Uhlmann in [28]). Let us point out that, the unique continuation from a proper boundary subset produces the extra log in our estimate. Furthermore, in order to be able to complete the proof of our first step, which requires utilizing the Runge-type argument (density in L^2 sense), we need to introduce a new operator norm $\|\,\cdot\,\|_*$ to establish the stability of the IBVPs under consideration. The more standard operator norm requires the Runge-type argument to hold in a stronger sense than the L^2 one but this does not seem to be possible. The fact of introducing $\|\,\cdot\,\|_*$ to establish stability of this problem is one of the novelties of our approach in comparison to the previous literature on stability for IBVPs with partial data.

The analytic unique continuation used in the fourth step does not produce any extra log since we are not enlarging the size of frequencies, we are just extending to low frequencies. This situation is different from [20], [8], [9] and [10].

The approach used in the case where the Dirichlet and Neumann data are measured on the same hyperplane is quite similar to this one. In that case, we use CGOs to construct u_1 and u_2 in a such a way that both of them vanish on $\Gamma_2 \cap \partial\Omega$; as a consequence, no Carleman estimate is required, so the proof of the integal estimate turns out to be simpler. However, the rest of the argument requires a quantification of the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma (cf. the proof of Theorem 8.22(f) from [17] for functions in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state the main results of this article. In Section 3, we prove the integral estimates for the two IBVPs under consideration. In Section 4, we prove the stability of the problem when the Dirichlet and Neumann data are measured on different hyperplanes. Section 5 is dedicated to the case where measurements are made on the same hyperplane.

2. Main results

In this section, we state the stability estimates that we announced in the introduction. In order to be precise, we will review some points from Section 1 with more details.

Let K be an arbitrary compact subset of Γ_1, and define

$$H_K^{3/2}(\Gamma_1) := \{f \in H^{3/2}(\Gamma_1) : \operatorname{supp} f \subseteq K\}.$$

Fix a potential $q \in L^\infty(\Sigma)$ which is compactly supported in Q. For a certain frequency $k \geq 0$ that we call admissible for q, we know that, given a compactly supported $w \in L^2(\Sigma)$, there exists a unique $v \in H^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\overline{\Sigma})$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} (-\Delta - k^2 + q)v & = & w \text{ in } \Sigma, \\ v|_{\partial\Sigma} & = & 0. \end{array} \right. \tag{1}$$

Moreover, for any bounded subset $\Omega \subset \Sigma$, we have the estimate

$$\|v\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C\|w\|_{L^2(\Sigma)},$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends on k, Ω, and any upper bound on $\|q\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)}$. For an account of this direct problem and a discussion of admissible frequencies, see [26]. The estimate bounding v in Ω was not stated in [26] but follows from their considerations.

The well-posedness of boundary value problem (1) implies that, given any $f \in H_K^{3/2}(\Gamma_1)$, there exists a unique admissible solution $u \in H^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\overline{\Sigma})$ to the following Dirichlet problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} (-\Delta - k^2 + q) \quad u & = & 0 \text{ in } \Sigma, \\ u|_{\Gamma_1} & = & f, \\ u|_{\Gamma_2} & = & 0. \end{array} \right. \tag{2}$$

The well-posedness of this problem allows us to define the following DN map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Lambda_q : H_K^{3/2}(\Gamma_1) & \to & H^{1/2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\partial\Sigma). \\ f & \mapsto & \partial_\nu u|_{\partial\Sigma} \end{array}$$

where u is the unique admissible solution to the problem (2). Let Λ_q^1 and Λ_q^2 denote the maps defined by

$$\Lambda_q^1 f := \Lambda_q f|_{\Gamma_1^N}, \quad \Lambda_q^2 f := \Lambda_q f|_{\Gamma_2^N}, \qquad \forall\, f \in H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_1^D}}(\Gamma_1).$$

Now we are ready to state the main results of this paper.

Theorem 1. *Let $k \geq 0$ be an admissible frequency for the zero potential. Then, there exists a norm $|||\,\cdot\,|||$ on $H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_1^D}}(\Gamma_1)$, which depends on k, such that, if $q \in L^\infty(\Sigma)$ with $\operatorname{supp} q \subseteq Q$ and if k is admissible for q, then Λ_q^l is a bounded operator from $\left(H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_1^D}}(\Gamma_1), |||\,\cdot\,|||\right)$ to $H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_l^N)$.*

Let $\|\,\cdot\,\|_*$ denote the operator norm of bounded linear operators from $\left(H^{3/2}_{\Gamma_1^D}(\Gamma_1), |\!|\!|\,\cdot\,|\!|\!|\right)$ to $H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_l^N)$.

Theorem 2. *Consider $s > 3/2$, and let q_1, q_2 belong to $H^s(\Sigma)$ and have their supports contained in Q. Consider $k \geq 0$ to be admissible for q_1, q_2 and the zero potential. Let M denote an upper bound on $\|q_j\|_{H^s(\Sigma)} \leq M$. Then, there exists $\delta = \delta(L, R, k) > 0$ such that, if $\|\Lambda^2_{q_2} - \Lambda^2_{q_1}\|_* < 1/\delta$, then*

$$\|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)} \lesssim \left(\log[1 + |\log(\delta\|\Lambda^2_{q_2} - \Lambda^2_{q_1}\|_*)|]\right)^{-\theta\frac{s-3/2}{s+1}}$$

with $0 < \theta < 1/10$. The implicit constant[2] only depends on L, R, k, M, s and δ.

Theorem 3. *Consider $s > 3/2$, and let q_1, q_2 belong to $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and have their supports contained in Q. Consider k to be admissible for q_1, q_2 and the zero potential. Let M denote an upper bound on $\|q_j\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq M$. Then, there exists $\delta = \delta(L, R, k) > 0$ such that, if $\|\Lambda^1_{q_2} - \Lambda^1_{q_1}\|_* < 1/\delta$, then*

$$\|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)} \lesssim \left(\log[1 + |\log(\delta\|\Lambda^1_{q_2} - \Lambda^1_{q_1}\|_*)|]\right)^{-\theta\frac{s-3/2}{s+1}}.$$

with $0 < \theta < 1/5$. The implicit constant in the last inequality depends on the same parameters as the implicit constant from the inequality in Theorem 2.

Our results hold in dimension $n = 3$. We have only considered the three dimensional case for the sake of simplicity but we believe that these results also hold for $n > 3$ following similar arguments.

3. Integral estimates

The main goal of this section is to prove the integral estimates that we announced in the introduction. Before stating these estimates, we will introduce a norm for $H^{3/2}_{\Gamma_1^D}(\Gamma_1)$ and we will prove Theorem 1.

Let $k \geq 0$ be an admissible frequency for the zero potential in Σ; we define, for each $f \in H^{3/2}_{\Gamma_1^D}(\Gamma_1)$, the norm

$$|\!|\!| f |\!|\!| := \|v_f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{3}$$

where $v_f \in H^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\overline{\Sigma})$ is the unique solution to

$$\begin{cases} -(\Delta + k^2)v_f &= 0 \text{ in } \Sigma, \\ v_f|_{\Gamma_1} &= f, \\ v_f|_{\Gamma_2} &= 0; \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

[2]Throughout the paper, we will write $a \lesssim b$ whenever a and b are non-negative quantities that satisfy $a \leq Cb$ for a certain constant $C > 0$. A constant $C > 0$ satisfying the previous inequality will be called an *implicit constant* and it will only depend on unimportant quantities such as L, R, k, M, s and δ.

and Ω is a bounded open subset of Σ which satisfies

$$\{x \in \Sigma : |x'| \leq R'\} \subset \Omega$$

and has a smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ such that

$$\partial\Omega \cap \Gamma_1 \subseteq \Gamma_1^D, \qquad \overline{\Gamma_j^N} \subseteq \mathrm{int}_{\Gamma_j}(\partial\Omega \cap \Gamma_j)$$

for $j = 1, 2$. Since we want Γ_1^D and Γ_j^N to be as small as possible, we now assume $R' < 2R$; at this moment, we fix Ω satisfying all of the above conditions together with

$$\Omega \subset \{x \in \Sigma : |x'| \leq 2R\}.$$

The norm $|||\,\cdot\,|||$ obviously depends on Ω and k but these dependences are harmless for our problems. The well-posedness of the problem (4), together with the fact that

$$|||f||| = 0 \Rightarrow f = 0, \tag{5}$$

guarantee that $|||\,\cdot\,|||$ is a norm on $H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_1^D}}(\Gamma_1)$. The property (5) follows from the weak unique continuation property for the equation $-(\Delta + k^2)v_f = 0$ in Σ.

With this new norm on $H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_1^D}}(\Gamma_1)$, we will show that Λ_q^j is a bounded operator.

Lemma 3.1. *The following inequality holds*

$$\|\Lambda_q^j f\|_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_j^N)} \lesssim |||f|||,$$

for every $f \in H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_1^D}}(\Gamma_1)$, *where*

$$\|\Lambda_q^j f\|_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_j^N)} := \sup_{g \in H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_j^N}}(\Gamma_j)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{|\int_{\Gamma_j} \Lambda_q f\, g\, dx'|}{\|g\|_{H^{3/2}(\Gamma_j)}}. \tag{6}$$

The implicit constant here depends on k, *any upper bound on* $\|q\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)}$ *and* Ω.

Note that Theorem 1 is an immediate consequence of this lemma. Moreover, Lemma 3.1 still holds if each occurrence of $\overline{\Gamma_1^D}$ in its statement is replaced by any compact subset K of Γ_1. In particular, the intersection between $\overline{\Omega}$ and K is even allowed to be empty.

Proof. Fix $f \in H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_1^D}}(\Gamma_1)$. For any $g \in H^{3/2}_{\overline{\Gamma_j^N}}(\Gamma_j)$, we have that

$$\int_{\Gamma_j} \Lambda_q f\, g\, dx' = \int_{\Gamma_j} \partial_\nu u\, g\, dx'$$

with u solving (2). By the trace theorem for Ω, there exists $v \in H^2(\Omega)$ such that $v(x) = g(x)$ for almost every $x \in \Gamma_j^N$, $v(x) = 0$ for almost every $x \in \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_j^N$, $\partial_\eta v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ and

$$\|v\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g\|_{H^{3/2}(\Gamma_j)}. \tag{7}$$

Here η denotes the outward-pointing unit normal vector along $\partial\Omega$, and the implicit constant depends on Ω. Then, using Green's formula, we get that

$$\int_{\Gamma_j} \Lambda_q f \, g \, dx' = \int_\Omega \Delta u v - u \Delta v \, dx$$

which, by (7), implies

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_j} \Lambda_q f \, g \, dx' \right| \lesssim \big(\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \big) \|g\|_{H^{3/2}(\Gamma_j)}.$$

Since u is solution to (2), we have

$$\|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq (k^2 + \|q\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)}) \|u\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}$$

and therefore, by (6),

$$\|\Lambda_q^j f\|_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_j^N)} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where the implicit constant depends on k, any upper bound on $\|q\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)}$ and Ω.

Let w be defined by $w := u - v_f$ with v_f as in (4). Then, $u = w + v_f$ with w being the unique solution to the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta - k^2 + q) w &= -q v_f \text{ in } \Sigma, \\ w|_{\partial\Sigma} &= 0. \end{cases}$$

By the triangle inequality and the well-posedness of this problem, we deduce

$$\|\Lambda_q^j f\|_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_j^N)} \lesssim \|v_f\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

which is nothing but the claimed inequality. □

Next, we turn our attention to the integral estimates, which can be stated as follows.

Proposition 3.2. *Fix potentials $q_1, q_2 \in L^\infty(\Sigma)$ both of which are compactly supported in Q, and let $M > 0$ denote an upper bound on $\|q_j\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)} \leq M$ for $j = 1, 2$. Consider $k \geq 0$ to be admissible for q_1, q_2 and the zero potential. Assume that u_1 and u_2 belong to $H^2(\Omega)$ and are solutions to*

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta - k^2 + q_1) u_1 &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u_1|_{\Gamma_2 \cap \partial\Omega} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(-\Delta - k^2 + q_2) u_2 = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

respectively.

(a) *If* $u_2|_{\Gamma_2\cap\partial\Omega}=0$, *then there exists a constant* $\delta=\delta(L,R,k)>0$ *such that, if* $\|\Lambda^1_{q_2}-\Lambda^1_{q_1}\|_*<1/\delta$, *then*

$$\left|\int_\Omega (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx\right| \lesssim \frac{\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}}{\left[1+\left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda^1_{q_2}-\Lambda^1_{q_1}\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{1/2}}.$$

(b) *There exist constants* $C=C(L,R)>0$ *and* $\delta=\delta(L,R,k)>0$ *such that, if* $\|\Lambda^2_{q_2}-\Lambda^2_{q_1}\|_*<1/\delta$, *then*

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Omega (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx\right| \lesssim & e^{c\tau|\zeta|}\frac{\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}}{\left[1+\left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda^2_{q_2}-\Lambda^2_{q_1}\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{1/2}}\\ &+\frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}\|e^{\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|e^{-\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau\geq\tau_0:=C(k^2+M)$ *and* $\zeta\in\mathbb{R}^3$ *with* $\zeta\cdot\eta|_{\Gamma_1^N}\geq 1$; *here,* $c>2(2R+L)$.

Proof. Let $v_1\in H^2_{\rm loc}(\overline{\Sigma})$ be a solution to $(-\Delta-k^2+q_1)v_1=0$ in Σ with $\mathrm{supp}(v_1|_{\partial\Sigma})\subseteq\overline{\Gamma_1^D}$. Writing $f:=v_1|_{\Gamma_1}$, we know that there exists a unique $v_2\in H^2_{\rm loc}(\overline{\Sigma})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}(-\Delta-k^2+q_2)v_2 &= 0 \text{ in } \Sigma,\\ v_2|_{\Gamma_1} &= f,\\ v_2|_{\Gamma_2} &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Then, $w:=v_2-v_1$ belongs to $H^2_{\rm loc}(\overline{\Sigma})$, and it is the unique admissible solution of

$$\begin{aligned}(-\Delta-k^2+q_2)w&=(q_1-q_2)v_1 \text{ in } \Sigma,\\ w|_{\partial\Sigma}&=0.\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx\\ &\quad=\int_\Omega (q_1-q_2)v_1\chi u_2\,dx+\int_\Omega (q_1-q_2)(u_1-v_1)u_2\,dx\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where χ is a bump function in $\mathbb{R}^2$ which satisfies $\chi(x')=1$ for $|x'|\leq R+\epsilon$ and $\mathrm{supp}\,\chi\subset\{|x'|\leq R'-\epsilon\}$ for a small enough $\epsilon>0$. Using the equation solved by w, applying Green's formula in Ω, utilizing the equation satisfied by u_2 together with $w|_{\partial\Sigma}=0$ and taking advantage of $\chi=0$ in a neighbourhood of $\partial\Omega\cap\Sigma$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega (q_1-q_2)v_1\chi u_2\,dx\\ &\quad=-\int_\Omega w(\Delta\chi u_2+2\nabla\chi\cdot\nabla u_2)\,dx-\int_{\Gamma_1^N\cup\Gamma_2^N}\chi u_2\partial_\nu w\,dx'.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

Using (9), (10) and that $\operatorname{supp} q_j \subseteq Q$ for $j = 1, 2$, we immediately see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_\Omega (q_1 - q_2) u_1 u_2 \, dx \right| &\lesssim \|\chi(u_1 - v_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\chi u_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &+ \left| \int_\Omega w(\Delta\chi u_2 + 2\nabla\chi \cdot \nabla u_2) \, dx \right| + \left| \int_{\Gamma_1^N \cup \Gamma_2^N} \chi u_2 \partial_\nu w \, dx' \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

We next have to obtain an upper bound on each term in the previous inequality. The method for estimating each of the two boundary integrals depends on whether the domain of integration does or does not coincide with the part of $\partial\Sigma$ on which the Neumann data is measured. The method for estimating the interior integral on the right-hand side of (11) relies on a quantified unique continuation property for w.

To fix ideas, let the Neumann data be measured on Γ_l^N. Start by estimating the boundary integral along Γ_l^N from (11). Using $\partial_\nu w|_{\partial\Sigma} = (\Lambda_{q_2} - \Lambda_{q_1})f$, $\operatorname{supp}\chi \subseteq \{|x'| \leq R'\}$, and (6), we get

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_l^N} \chi u_2 \partial_\nu w \, dx' \right| \leq \|\chi u_2\|_{H^{3/2}(\Gamma_l)} \|(\Lambda_{q_1}^l - \Lambda_{q_2}^l) f\|_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_l^N)}.$$

The last term on the right-hand side can be estimated using the definition of the operator norm and (3) as follows:

$$\|(\Lambda_{q_1}^l - \Lambda_{q_2}^l) f\|_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_l^N)} \leq \|\Lambda_{q_1}^l - \Lambda_{q_2}^l\|_* (\|v_f - v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}), \tag{12}$$

where v_f satisfies (4). Note that $v_f - v_1$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta - k^2)(v_f - v_1) &= q_1 v_1 \text{ in } \Sigma, \\ (v_f - v_1)|_{\partial\Sigma} &= 0. \end{cases}$$

By the well-posedness of this problem, we have

$$\|v_f - v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\chi v_1\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}. \tag{13}$$

Thus, using (12), (13) and the boundedness of the trace operator associated with Ω, the boundary term under consideration is bounded in the following way:

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_l^N} \chi u_2 \partial_\nu w \, dx' \right| \lesssim \|\Lambda_{q_1}^l - \Lambda_{q_2}^l\|_* \|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \|v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{14}$$

Under the assumptions in (a), the inequalities (14) and (11) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_\Omega (q_1 - q_2) u_1 u_2 \, dx \right| &\lesssim \|u_1 - v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &+ \|w\|_{L^2(Q')} \|u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\Lambda_{q_1}^1 - \Lambda_{q_2}^1\|_* \|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \|v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $Q' := \{x \in \Sigma : R + \epsilon < |x'| < R' - \epsilon\}$. In order to get the estimate in (a) from (15), we have to control w in Q' and $u_1 - v_1$ in Ω. We postpone this for a while; instead, we now focus on estimating the

other boundary term in (11), which only appears under the assumptions in (b). More concretely, we focus on estimating the term

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_1^N} \chi u_2 \partial_\nu w \, dx' \right| \tag{16}$$

in terms of $\|\Lambda_{q_2}^2 - \Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*$ and a sufficiently large parameter τ.

To fix ideas, let $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be arbitrarily chosen with $\zeta \cdot e_3 \geq 1$. In order to control (16), we use a Carleman inequality proven by Bukhgeim and Uhlmann in [5] (see Corollary 2.3). Since $|\zeta| \geq |\zeta \cdot e_3| \geq 1$, the Carleman inequality can be applied to our situation as follows: For any $q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M$, there exists a constant $C = C(L, R) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^2 \int_\Omega |e^{-\tau x \cdot \zeta} u|^2 \, dx + \tau \int_{\partial\Omega} (\zeta \cdot \eta) |e^{-\tau x \cdot \zeta} \partial_\eta u|^2 \, dS \\ \lesssim \int_\Omega |e^{-\tau x \cdot \zeta} (-\Delta - k^2 + q) u|^2 \, dx \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for all $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ with $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, $\tau \geq C(k^2 + M)$; the implicit constant in (17) depends on R and L.

Start by noting that

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_1^N} \chi u_2 \partial_\nu w \, dx' \right| \leq \|e^{\tau x \cdot \zeta} u_2\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1^N)} \|e^{-\tau x \cdot \zeta} \partial_\eta (\chi w)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1^N)} \tag{18}$$

since $\eta|_{\Gamma_1^N} = \nu|_{\Gamma_1^N}$ is a constant multiple of e_3 and since $\partial_{x_3} \chi = 0$. Here e_3 denotes the vector satisfying $x_3 = e_3 \cdot x$. The first term on the right-hand side can be bounded as follows

$$\|e^{\tau x \cdot \zeta} u_2\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1^N)} \lesssim \|e^{\tau x \cdot \zeta} u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \tag{19}$$

using the boundedness of the trace operator associated with Ω, where the implicit constant depends on Ω. We estimate the second term on the right-hand side of (18) as

$$\|e^{-\tau x \cdot \zeta} \partial_\eta (\chi w)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_1^N)}^2 \leq \int_{\Gamma_1^N} \zeta \cdot \eta |e^{-\tau x \cdot \zeta} \partial_\eta (\chi w)|^2 \, dx'. \tag{20}$$

Since $\chi w \in H^2(\Omega)$ vanishes on $\partial\Omega$, an application of (17) with u replaced by χw and q replaced by q_2 shows that the right-hand side of (20) can be bounded by

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \int_\Omega |e^{-\tau x \cdot \zeta} (-\Delta - k^2 + q_2)(\chi w)|^2 \, dx + |\zeta| e^{2c\tau|\zeta|} \|\chi \partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_2)}^2, \tag{21}$$

where $c := 2R + L$ is not the c from the statement of Proposition 3.2 (b). Furthermore, since w solves (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |e^{-\tau x\cdot\zeta}(-\Delta - k^2 + q_2)(\chi w)|^2\,dx &\lesssim e^{2c\tau|\zeta|}\|v_1 - u_1\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \|e^{-\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_1\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_\Omega |e^{-\tau x\cdot\zeta}(\Delta\chi w + 2\nabla\chi\cdot\nabla w)|^2\,dx \\ &\lesssim e^{2c\tau|\zeta|}\|w\|^2_{H^1(Q')} + \big(e^{2c\tau|\zeta|}\|v_1 - u_1\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|e^{-\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_1\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\big).\end{aligned}$$

These computations are meant to bound the first term in (21). We now take care of the second one. By interpolation and using that $\partial_\nu w|_{\partial\Sigma} = (\Lambda_{q_2} - \Lambda_{q_1})f$, we get

$$\|\chi\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_2)} \le \|\chi(\Lambda_{q_2} - \Lambda_{q_1})f\|^{1/4}_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_2)}\|\chi\partial_\nu w\|^{3/4}_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma_2)}.$$

It is a simple computation to show that

$$\|\chi(\Lambda_{q_2} - \Lambda_{q_1})f\|_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_2)} \lesssim \|(\Lambda^2_{q_2} - \Lambda^2_{q_1})f\|_{H^{-3/2}(\Gamma_2^N)}$$

with the implicit constant depending on R. Following (12) and (13), we get

$$\|\chi\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_2)} \lesssim \|\Lambda^2_{q_2} - \Lambda^2_{q_1}\|^{1/4}_*\|v_1\|^{1/4}_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\chi\partial_\nu w\|^{3/4}_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma_2)}.$$

In order to estimate the last factor on the right-hand side, we are going to use the boundedness of the trace operator in Ω and the well-posedness of (8) to get control on $\|w\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$. Thus, we get

$$\|\chi\partial_\nu w\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma_2)} \lesssim \|w\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

which implies

$$\|\chi\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_2)} \lesssim \|\Lambda^2_{q_2} - \Lambda^2_{q_1}\|^{1/4}_*\|v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{22}$$

Finally, gathering (18), (19), (20) and the computations to estimate each term on (21), we can state that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\Gamma_1^N}\chi u_2\partial_\nu w\,dx'\right| \lesssim \|e^{\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\Bigg[&\frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}\|e^{-\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &+\frac{e^{c\tau|\zeta|}}{\tau^{1/2}}\big(\|w\|_{H^1(Q')} + \|v_1 - u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\big) \\ &+|\zeta|^{1/2}e^{c\tau|\zeta|}\|\Lambda^2_{q_2} - \Lambda^2_{q_1}\|^{1/4}_*\|v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Bigg].\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Before proceeding with the proof of the claimed integral estimates, let us write down what the estimate, under the assumptions in (b),

looks like at this stage: by (11), (14) and (23), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Omega (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx\right| &\lesssim \|u_1-v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\quad+\|w\|_{L^2(Q')}\|u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}+\|\Lambda_{q_1}^2-\Lambda_{q_2}^2\|_*\|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\|v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\quad+\|e^{\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\bigg[\frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}\|e^{-\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\quad+\frac{e^{c\tau|\zeta|}}{\tau^{1/2}}\big(\|w\|_{H^1(Q')}+\|v_1-u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\big)\\ &\quad+|\zeta|^{1/2}e^{c\tau|\zeta|}\|\Lambda_{q_2}^2-\Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*^{1/4}\|v_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\bigg]\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

for all $\tau\geq C(k^2+M)$ and $\zeta\in\mathbb{R}^3$ with $\zeta\cdot e_3\geq 1$.

In the next step, we will control w in Q' by using quantified unique continuation from the boundary. This will be applied to (15) and (24) to obtain the estimates in (a) and (b), respectively.

Proceed with the control of w in Q'. We may assume w not to vanish identically in Q', otherwise we do not have anything to control. In order to estimate a non-identically-vanishing w, we will apply an estimate due to Phung (see Théorème 1.1 in [32]) which reads as follows in our particular case: Let U be a smooth open subset of Ω containing Q' with $U\cap Q=\emptyset$. Then, there exists a $d>0$, which depends on U, Γ and k, such that, if

$$\frac{\|w\|_{H^2(U)}}{\|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}}\geq\frac{1}{d},\tag{25}$$

with $\Gamma:=\{x\in\Gamma_l^N : R+\epsilon<|x'|<R'-\epsilon\}$ for the ϵ already chosen, then

$$\|w\|_{H^1(U)}\lesssim\frac{\|w\|_{H^2(U)}}{\left[\log\left(e\frac{d\|w\|_{H^2(U)}}{\|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}}\right)\right]^{1/2}}.\tag{26}$$

Obviously, $\Gamma\subseteq\partial U\cap\Gamma_l$. Note that, by $w|_{\partial\Sigma}=0$ and by unique continuation from the boundary, we can ensure that $\|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}>0$.

On the one hand, by the well-posedness of the problem satisfied by w, we know that

$$\|w\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\lesssim\|v_1-u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

with the implicit constant depending on Ω, M and k. On the other hand, considering another bump function χ' in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\chi(x')=1$ for $|x'|\leq R'-\epsilon$ and $\chi'(x')=0$ for $|x'|>R'-\epsilon/2$, we have, by the same argument that we used to get (22) with χ' instead of χ, that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}&\leq\|\chi'\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_l)}\\ &\lesssim\|\Lambda_{q_2}^l-\Lambda_{q_1}^l\|_*^{1/4}\big(\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|v_1-u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the implicit constants in the previous inequalities can be chosen to be the same. Thus, since the function

$$t \mapsto \frac{t}{(\log t)^{1/2}}$$

is increasing on (e, ∞) and since the right-hand side of (26) can be written as

$$\frac{\|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}}{ed} \frac{e^{\frac{d\|w\|_{H^2(U)}}{\|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}}}}{\left[\log\left(e^{\frac{d\|w\|_{H^2(U)}}{\|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}}}\right)\right]^{1/2}},$$

the last two inequalities can be combined with (25) and (26) to deduce the following: if $\|\Lambda^l_{q_2} - \Lambda^l_{q_1}\|_* < d^4$, we have

$$\|w\|_{H^1(U)} \lesssim \frac{\|v_1 - u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}{\left[1 + \left|\log\left(d^{-4}\|\Lambda^l_{q_2} - \Lambda^l_{q_1}\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{1/2}}. \tag{27}$$

From now until the end of the proof, we shall write $\delta := d^{-4}$ and we shall assume $\|\Lambda^l_{q_2} - \Lambda^l_{q_1}\|_* < \delta^{-1}$ (so that we do not have to state this condition explicitly every time).

At this stage, the proofs of both parts of Proposition 3.2 are almost complete. What remains for us to do is, firstly, to apply (27) to each inequality of (15), (24) thus obtaining two new inequalities and, secondly, to apply the announced Runge-type approximation to the two new inequalities. We now go on to finish the proof of Proposition 3.2, whereby we shall omit all lengthy but straightforward calculations.

The Runge-type approximation can be stated as follows: For all u_1 as in the statement of Proposition 3.2 and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $v_1 \in H^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\overline{\Sigma})$ solving $(-\Delta - k^2 + q_1)v_1 = 0$ in Σ with $\mathrm{supp}(v_1|_{\partial\Sigma}) \subseteq \overline{\Gamma_1^D}$ such that

$$\|v_1 - u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \varepsilon.$$

With regard to part (a) of Proposition 3.2: by applying (27) to (15) and then by applying the approximation result to the resulting inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Omega (q_1 - q_2)u_1 u_2\, dx\right| \lesssim & \frac{\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}}{\left[1 + \left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda^1_{q_2} - \Lambda^1_{q_1}\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{1/2}} \\ & + \|\Lambda^1_{q_1} - \Lambda^1_{q_2}\|_*\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}.\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

With regard to part (b) of Proposition 3.2: we argue analogously by firstly applying (27) to (24) and secondly by applying the approximation result to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Omega (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx\right| &\lesssim \frac{\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}}{\left[1+\left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda^2_{q_2}-\Lambda^2_{q_1}\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{1/2}}\\ &+\|\Lambda^2_{q_1}-\Lambda^2_{q_2}\|_*\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\\ &+\|e^{\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\left(\frac{e^{c\tau|\zeta|}}{\tau^{1/2}}\frac{\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}{\left[1+\left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda^2_{q_2}-\Lambda^2_{q_1}\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{1/2}}\right.\\ &\left.+\frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}\|e^{-\tau x\cdot\zeta}u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+|\zeta|^{1/2}e^{c\tau|\zeta|}\|\Lambda^2_{q_2}-\Lambda^2_{q_1}\|_*^{1/4}\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

By dropping higher-order terms from the right-hand side of (28) and (29) (possibly at the cost of increasing the implicit constants in each of these inequalities), we arrive at the estimate claimed in (a) and (b). □

4. Proof of Theorem 2

In this section, we prove Theorem 2. To achieve this task, we will construct appropriate CGOs, use those CGOs to construct the functions u_1 and u_2 appearing in the integral estimate of Proposition 3.2 (b), and eventually obtain an upper bound on $(\widehat{q_1}-\widehat{q_2})(\xi)$ at each frequency ξ from

$$\{\xi=(\xi',\xi_3)\in\mathbb{R}^3 : 1\le|\xi'|<r, |\xi_3|<r\};$$

then, we will extend our control on $\widehat{q_1}-\widehat{q_2}$ to the ball

$$\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^3 : |\xi|<r\}.$$

After this, we will carry out a classical argument due to Alessandrini (see [1]) in order to obtain the stability estimate.

From now until the end of this section, we abuse notation by letting q_j stand both for the potential from the statement of Theorem 2 (which is only defined on Σ) and for its trivial extension to all of $\mathbb{R}^3$. The meaning will be clear from the context; for example, $\widehat{q_j}$ refers to the Fourier transform of the trivial extension of q_j to all of $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Start by stating the CGOs used to prove Theorem 2. We perform the reflection argument originating from the work of Isakov in [24]. Let $r>2$, which will be specified later on in this section.

Let $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^3$ with

$$1\le\xi_{1e}:=\sqrt{\xi_1^2+\xi_2^2}<r \quad\text{and}\quad |\xi_3|<r,\tag{30}$$

be arbitrarily chosen. We define

$$\begin{aligned} e(1) &:= \frac{1}{\xi_{1e}}(\xi_1, \xi_2, 0), \\ e(3) &:= (0,0,1), \\ e(2) &:= e(3) \times e(1) = \frac{1}{\xi_{1e}}(-\xi_2, \xi_1, 0). \end{aligned}$$

We set $x^* := (x_1, x_2, -x_3)$ for any $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $f^*(x) := f(x^*)$ for any function f, and $G^* = \{x^* : x \in G\}$ for any domain G. The coordinates of any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with respect to the orthonormal basis $\{e(j)\}_{j=1}^3$ shall be denoted by $x = (x_{1e}, x_{2e}, x_{3e})_e$. Note $\xi = (\xi_{1e}, 0, \xi_3)_e$. We also write $\xi^\perp := (-\xi_3, 0, \xi_{1e})_e$.

As preparation for the reflection argument, we now fix a smooth bounded domain $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$\overline{\Omega \cup \Omega^*} \subseteq B, \quad B^* = B.$$

Let $Q_1 \in L^\infty(B)$ be the even extension of q_1 about the coordinate variable x_3 and $Q_2 \in L^\infty(B)$ be the trivial extension of q_2 to all of B; explicitly, we define

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(x) &:= q_1(x)\chi_\Sigma(x) + q_1(x^*)\chi_{\Sigma^*}(x), \\ Q_2(x) &:= q_2(x)\chi_\Sigma(x), \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where χ_Σ and χ_{Σ^*} denote the characteristic functions of Σ and Σ^* respectively.

As in [28], we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &:= \left(-\tau\xi_3 + \frac{i}{2}\xi_{1e}, i|\xi|(\tau^2 - 1/4)^{1/2}, \tau\xi_{1e} + \frac{i}{2}\xi_3\right)_e \\ &= \tau\xi^\perp + i\left(\frac{1}{2}\xi + |\xi|(\tau^2 - 1/4)^{1/2}e(2)\right), \\ \rho_2 &:= \left(\tau\xi_3 + \frac{i}{2}\xi_{1e}, -i|\xi|(\tau^2 - 1/4)^{1/2}, -\tau\xi_{1e} + \frac{i}{2}\xi_3\right)_e \\ &= -\tau\xi^\perp + i\left(\frac{1}{2}\xi - |\xi|(\tau^2 - 1/4)^{1/2}e(2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

One immediately computes that

$$\rho_m \cdot \rho_m = 0, \quad |\rho_m| = \sqrt{2}\tau|\xi|, \quad m = 1, 2. \tag{31}$$

The ρ_1 and ρ_2 will be the candidates to construct the family of CGOs. It is a well-known fact that there exists a function $V_m \in H^2(B)$ solving

$$(-\Delta + Q_m - k^2)V_m = 0 \text{ in } B \tag{32}$$

and having the form $V_m = e^{x\cdot\rho_m}(1 + \psi_m)$, where the remainder ψ_m obeys

$$\|\psi_m\|_{H^k(B)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\tau^{1-k}}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \tag{33}$$

for all $\tau \geq \tau_1 := \max(C_0(M+k^2),1)$, with $C_0 \geq 1$ depending on B. The implicit constant in (33) depends on B, M and k.

Recall that Proposition 3.2 (b) requires for u_1 to satisfy $u_1|_{\partial\Omega\cap\Gamma_2} = 0$; this boundary condition can be arranged to hold via Isakov's reflection argument from [24]. Employing the same idea as in [28], we set

$$u_1(x) := e^{x\cdot\rho_1}(1+\psi_1(x)) - e^{x^*\cdot\rho_1}(1+\psi_1^*(x)), \tag{34}$$

$$u_2(x) := e^{x\cdot\rho_2}(1+\psi_2(x)). \tag{35}$$

The construction of ψ_1, ψ_2, u_1, u_2 ensures that $u_1|_\Omega$ and $u_2|_\Omega$ satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 3.2 (b).

Let us compute that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx = &\int_\Sigma e^{ix\cdot\xi}(1+\psi_1)(1+\psi_2)(q_1-q_2)\,dx\\ &- \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix_{1e}\xi_{1e}}e^{-2\tau x_3\xi_{1e}}(1+\psi_1^*)(1+\psi_2)\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Sigma e^{ix\cdot\xi}(q_1-q_2)\,dx\right| &\leq \left|\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx\right|\\ &+ \left|\int_\Sigma e^{ix\cdot\xi}(q_1-q_2)(\psi_1+\psi_2+\psi_1\psi_2)\,dx\right|\\ &+ \left|\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix_{1e}\xi_{1e}}e^{-2\tau x_3\xi_{1e}}(1+\psi_1^*)(1+\psi_2)\,dx\right|.\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

By applying the triangle inequality, using that $\operatorname{supp}(q_m) \subseteq Q$, and using $\|q_m\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)} \lesssim 1$, we verify that

$$\left|\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix_{1e}\xi_{1e}}e^{-2\tau x_3\xi_{1e}}\,dx\right| \lesssim \frac{1}{\tau}. \tag{37}$$

Let us now apply (33) and (37) to (36) to obtain

$$\left|\int_\Sigma e^{ix\cdot\xi}(q_1-q_2)\,dx\right| \lesssim \left|\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx\right| + \frac{1}{\tau}$$

for $\tau \geq \tau_1$, and u_1, u_2 defined by (34) and (35). As noted earlier, the functions $u_1|_\Omega$ and $u_2|_\Omega$ satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 3.2, so we may apply Proposition 3.2 (b) with $\zeta = \xi^\perp$ to deduce that, if $\|\Lambda_{q_1}^2 - \Lambda_{q_2}^2\|_* < 1/\delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix\cdot\xi}\,dx\right| \lesssim &\frac{1}{\tau} + e^{c\tau|\xi|}\frac{\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}}{\left[1+\left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_2}^2-\Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{1/2}}\\ &+ \frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}\|e^{\tau x\cdot\xi^\perp}u_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|e^{-\tau x\cdot\xi^\perp}u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau \geq \max(\tau_0,\tau_1)$.

The choices of ρ_m and u_m can be combined with (33) to deduce that

$$\left| \int_\Sigma (q_1 - q_2) e^{ix\cdot\xi}\, dx \right| \lesssim \frac{e^{c\tau|\xi|}}{\left[1 + \left| \log\left(\delta \|\Lambda_{q_2}^2 - \Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*\right) \right|\right]^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}$$

for all $\tau \geq \max(\tau_0, \tau_1)$, with $c > 4(2R + L)$. Thus, we obtain the uniform estimate

$$\left|\widehat{q_1}(\xi) - \widehat{q_2}(\xi)\right| \lesssim \frac{e^{c\tau r}}{\left[1 + \left| \log\left(\delta \|\Lambda_{q_2}^2 - \Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*\right) \right|\right]^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}. \tag{38}$$

for all $\tau \geq \max(\tau_0, \tau_1)$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $1 \leq \xi_{1e} < r$, $|\xi_3| < r$. Now, we are going to use analytic continuation in order to extend the set of frequencies, at which we control the difference $\widehat{q_1} - \widehat{q_2}$, to all of $\{|\xi| < r\}$.

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $0 < \xi_{1e} < 1$, $|\xi_3| < r$ be arbitrarily chosen; define $e(1), e(2), e(3)$ as we did earlier. By the Payley-Wiener theorem, $\widehat{q_1} - \widehat{q_2}$ is the restriction to $\mathbb{R}^3$ of an entire function on $\mathbb{C}^3$. Therefore, the function f defined by

$$\begin{aligned} f : \mathbb{C} &\to \mathbb{C} \\ z &\mapsto (\widehat{q_1} - \widehat{q_2})\left((z, 0, \xi_3)_e\right) \end{aligned}$$

is entire. If we define

$$\begin{aligned} G &:= \{s + it \in \mathbb{C} : |s| < 2, |t| < 2\}, \\ \gamma &:= \{s + it \in \mathbb{C} : 0 < s < 1, t = 0\}, \\ \Gamma_0 &:= \{s + it \in \mathbb{C} : 1 < s < 2, t = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

then Corollary 1.2.2 (b) from [23] implies that there exist constants $C_0 > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, both of which depend on γ, such that

$$\sup_\gamma |f(s)| \leq C_0 (\sup_G |f(s + it)|)^{1-\lambda} (\sup_{\Gamma_0} |f(s)|)^\lambda.$$

Since

$$\sup_G |f(s + it)| \lesssim 1,$$

and since $\sup_{\Gamma_0} |f(s)|$ can be bounded by means of (38), we can conclude

$$\left|\widehat{q_1}(\xi) - \widehat{q_2}(\xi)\right| \lesssim \frac{e^{c\lambda\tau r}}{\left[1 + \left| \log\left(\delta \|\Lambda_{q_2}^2 - \Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*\right) \right|\right]^{\lambda/2}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{\lambda/2}} \tag{39}$$

for all $\tau \geq \max(\tau_0, \tau_1)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $0 < \xi_{1e} < 1$, $|\xi_3| < r$.

We go on to combine (38) and (39), then drop higher-order terms (possibly at the cost of increasing the implicit constant), and thus

conclude the following:

$$\left|\widehat{q_1}(\xi)-\widehat{q_2}(\xi)\right| \lesssim \frac{e^{c\tau r}}{\left[1+\left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_2}^2-\Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{\lambda/2}}+\frac{1}{\tau^{\lambda/2}} \tag{40}$$

for all $\tau \geq \max(\tau_0,\tau_1)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $|\xi|<r$.

Next, we finish the proof of Theorem 2 by performing the classical argument due to Alessandrini [1]. If we put $\varepsilon := \frac{s-\frac{3}{2}}{2}$ (so that $s=\frac{3}{2}+2\varepsilon$), we may apply the Sobolev embedding theorem and interpolation together with the a-priori bounds on q_1, q_2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|q_1-q_2\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)} = \|q_1-q_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\lesssim \|q_1-q_2\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|q_1-q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{s+1}}\|q_1-q_2\|_{H^s(\Omega)}^{\frac{s-\varepsilon+1}{s+1}} \\ &\lesssim \|q_1-q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{s+1}} \leq \|q_1-q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{s+1}}.\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

On the other hand, by using the definition of $\|\,\cdot\,\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ in terms of the Fourier transform, then splitting the integral into high and low frequencies, and lastly using Plancharel's theorem, we get

$$\|q_1-q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim r^3 \sup_{\{|\xi|<r\}}|\widehat{q_1}(\xi)-\widehat{q_2}(\xi)|^2+r^{-2}.$$

Applying (40) to the last estimate, utilizing $\tau \geq 1$, and for $c>4(2R+L)+1$, we get

$$\|q_1-q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{e^{c\tau r}}{\left[1+\left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_2}^2-\Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{\lambda/2}}+r^{3/2}\tau^{-\lambda/2}+r^{-1}.$$

Upon selecting τ so that $r^{-1}=r^{3/2}\tau^{-\lambda/2}$ or, equivalently, as $\tau := r^{5/\lambda}$, the preceding estimate implies

$$\|q_1-q_2\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \frac{e^{cr^{\frac{\lambda+5}{\lambda}}}}{\left[1+\left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_2}^2-\Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{\lambda/2}}+r^{-1}.$$

Choose $r>0$ so that

$$r^{\frac{\lambda+5}{\lambda}} = c^{-1}\log\left\{\left[1+\left|\log(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_2}^2-\Lambda_{q_1}^2\|_*)\right|\right]^{\lambda/4}\right\}$$

in the last inequality and combine it with (41); in the resulting inequality, we drop higher-order terms (possibly at the cost of increasing the implicit constant), and thus derive the stability estimate of Theorem 2 with $\theta := \frac{\lambda}{2(\lambda+5)}$.

5. Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we prove Theorem 3. In doing so, we imitate the arguments from Section 4; broadly speaking, the main difference is that occurrences of $(\widehat{q_1} - \widehat{q_2})$ from Section 4 will now be replaced by occurrences of $(Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}})\widehat{\ }$, where Q_j^{even} stands for the even extension of $q_j|_{\{x_3 \geq 0\}}$ to $\mathbb{R}^3$ about the coordinate variable x_3.

As in Section 4, we begin by constructing appropriate CGOs by means of Isakov's reflection argument from [24]. Consider $r > 2$, which will be specified later on in this section.

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with

$$1 \leq \xi_{1e} < r \quad \text{and} \quad |\xi_3| < r,$$

be arbitrarily chosen. Define $e(1), e(2), e(3)$ as in Section 4.

From now until the end of this section, we let Q_j^{even} stand for the even extension of q_j about the coordinate variable x_3; explicitly, we set

$$Q_j^{\text{even}}(x) := q_j(x) + q_j(x^*) \qquad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Thanks to the regularity hypotheses on q_j, we have that Q_1^{even} and Q_2^{even} belong to $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and have their supports contained in $Q \cup Q^*$.

Fix B as in Section 4. Following the idea from Section 4 in [28], we will construct u_1 and u_2 via Isakov's reflection argument. Firstly, we define

$$(42)\rho_1 := \left(i\left(\frac{\xi_{1e}}{2} - \alpha\xi_3\right), -(\alpha^2 + 1/4)^{1/2}|\xi|, i\left(\frac{\xi_3}{2} + \alpha\xi_{1e}\right)\right)_e,$$

$$(43)\rho_2 := \left(i\left(\frac{\xi_{1e}}{2} + \alpha\xi_3\right), (\alpha^2 + 1/4)^{1/2}|\xi|, i\left(\frac{\xi_3}{2} - \alpha\xi_{1e}\right)\right)_e,$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is a parameter. One readily verifies that

$$\rho_m \cdot \rho_m = 0, \quad |\rho_m| = \sqrt{2}|\xi|(\alpha^2 + 1/4)^{1/2}, \quad m = 1, 2.$$

It is a well-known fact that there exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(B, M, k) \geq 1$ such that, for each $\alpha \geq \alpha_2 := \max(C_0(M + k^2), 1)$, there exists a function $\psi_m \in H^2(B)$ satisfying

$$(44) \qquad \|\psi_m\|_{H^k(B)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\left[(\alpha^2 + 1/4)^{1/2}|\xi|\right]^{1-k}}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \quad m = 1, 2$$

such that $V_m(x) := e^{x\cdot\rho_m}(1 + \psi_m)$ belongs to $H^2(B)$ and satisfies

$$(-\Delta + Q_m^{\text{even}} - k^2)V_m = 0 \text{ in } B.$$

The implicit constant in (44) depends on B, M, k. Regarding the existence of CGOs, in this context, we refer to [5], [15] and [19].

Employing the same idea as in [28], we set

$$(45) \qquad u_m(x) := e^{x\cdot\rho_m}(1 + \psi_m) - e^{x^*\cdot\rho_m}(1 + \psi_m^*);$$

it then follows that $u_1|_\Omega$ and $u_2|_\Omega$ satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 3.2 (a). On the one hand, a routine computation utilizing the decay estimates from (44) shows that

$$\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim e^{cr(\alpha^2+1/4)^{1/2}}, \tag{46}$$

$$\|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim e^{cr(\alpha^2+1/4)^{1/2}}, \tag{47}$$

with the implicit constants depending on B, n, M, k; at this stage, we have increased c if necessary. On the other hand, a direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx = {} & \\
& \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix\cdot\xi}\,dx + \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix\cdot\xi}(\psi_1+\psi_2+\psi_1\psi_2)\,dx \\
& - \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix\cdot(\xi_{1e},0,2\alpha\xi_{1e})_e}\,dx \\
& - \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix\cdot(\xi_{1e},0,2\alpha\xi_{1e})_e}(\psi_1+\psi_2^*+\psi_1\psi_2^*)\,dx \\
& - \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix\cdot(\xi_{1e},0,-2\alpha\xi_{1e})_e}\,dx \\
& - \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix\cdot(\xi_{1e},0,-2\alpha\xi_{1e})_e}(\psi_1^*+\psi_2+\psi_1^*\psi_2)\,dx \\
& + \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix^*\cdot\xi}\,dx + \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix^*\cdot\xi}(\psi_1^*+\psi_2^*+\psi_1^*\psi_2^*)\,dx;
\end{aligned}$$

combining this with the hypotheses on q_1-q_2, (44), and $|\xi| \geq \xi_{1e} \geq 1$ establishes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix\cdot\xi}\,dx + \int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)e^{ix^*\cdot\xi}\,dx\right| \lesssim \left|\int_\Sigma (q_1-q_2)u_1u_2\,dx\right| \\
& + \left|(q_1-q_2)\widehat{\ }\big((-\xi_{1e},0,-2\alpha\xi_{1e})_e\big)\right| + \left|(q_1-q_2)\widehat{\ }\big((-\xi_{1e},0,2\alpha\xi_{1e})_e\big)\right| \\
& + \frac{1}{(\alpha^2+1/4)^{1/2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant depends on B, M, k. For technical reasons, let us replace ξ by $-\xi$. Now, we apply the quantified Riemann-Lebesgue lemma to $f := q_1-q_2$ (in order to handle the Fourier transforms on the right-hand side in the last inequality), Proposition 3.2 (a), (46), and (47) to obtain

$$|(Q_1^{\mathrm{even}}-Q_2^{\mathrm{even}})\widehat{\ }(\xi)| \lesssim \frac{e^{cr(\alpha^2+1/4)^{1/2}}}{\big[1+|\log(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_1}^1-\Lambda_{q_2}^1\|_*)|\big]^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{(\alpha^2+1/4)^{1/2}}$$

whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_2$. Here we have increased c.

For the sake of brevity and the ease of comparison with the arguments from the previous section, let us introduce a new parameter

$\tau := (\alpha^2 + 1/4)^{1/2}$. Using this new parameter, we have obtained the following inequality: there exists a constant $T_2 := (\alpha_2^2 + 1/4)^{1/2}$ such that

$$|(Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}})\widehat{\ }(\xi)| \lesssim \frac{e^{cr\tau}}{\left[1 + |\log(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_1}^1 - \Lambda_{q_2}^1\|_*)|\right]^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{\tau} \tag{48}$$

for all $\tau \geq T_2$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $1 \leq \xi_{1e} < r$, $|\xi_3| < r$.

Now, we are going to use analytic continuation in order to extend the set of frequencies, at which we control the difference $(Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}})\widehat{\ }$, to all of $\{|\xi| < r\}$.

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $0 < \xi_{1e} < 1$, $|\xi_3| < r$ be arbitrarily chosen; define $e(1), e(2), e(3)$ as we did earlier. By the Payley-Wiener theorem, $(Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}})\widehat{\ }$ is the restriction to $\mathbb{R}^3$ of an entire function on $\mathbb{C}^3$. Therefore, the function g defined by

$$\begin{aligned} g : \mathbb{C} &\to \mathbb{C} \\ z &\mapsto (Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}})\widehat{\ }((z, 0, \xi_3)_e) \end{aligned}$$

is entire. If G, γ, Γ_0 stand for the same sets as in Section 4, then Corollary 1.2.2 (b) from [23] implies that there exist constants $C_0 > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, both of which depend on γ, such that

$$\sup_{\gamma} |f(s)| \leq C_0 (\sup_{G} |f(s + it)|)^{1-\lambda} (\sup_{\Gamma_0} |f(s)|)^{\lambda}.$$

Again, as in Section 4, we verify that $\sup_G |g(s)| \lesssim 1$ while $\sup_{\Gamma_0} |g(s)|$ can be bounded by means of (48), enabling us to conclude

$$\left|(Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}})\widehat{\ }(\xi)\right| \lesssim \frac{e^{c\lambda\tau r}}{\left[1 + \left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_2}^1 - \Lambda_{q_1}^1\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{\lambda/2}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{\lambda}} \tag{49}$$

for all $\tau \geq T_2$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $0 < \xi_{1e} < 1$, $|\xi_3| < r$.

We go on to combine (48) and (49), then drop higher-order terms (possibly at the cost of increasing the implicit constant), and thus conclude the following:

$$\left|(Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}})\widehat{\ }(\xi)\right| \lesssim \frac{e^{c\tau r}}{\left[1 + \left|\log\left(\delta\|\Lambda_{q_2}^1 - \Lambda_{q_1}^1\|_*\right)\right|\right]^{\lambda/2}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{\lambda}} \tag{50}$$

for all $\tau \geq T_2$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $|\xi| < r$.

Next, we finish the proof of Theorem 3 by performing the classical argument due to Alessandrini [1]. If we put $\varepsilon := \frac{s - \frac{3}{2}}{2}$ (so that $s = \frac{3}{2} + 2\varepsilon$), we may apply the Sobolev embedding theorem and interpolation

together with the a-priori bounds on q_1, q_2 to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)} &= \|Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim \|Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}}\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \|Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}}\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{s+1}} \|Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}}\|_{H^s(\Omega)}^{\frac{s-\varepsilon+1}{s+1}} \\
&\lesssim \|Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}}\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{s+1}} \leq \|Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}}\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{s+1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}
$$

Again, as in Section 4, by using the definition of $\| \cdot \|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ in terms of the Fourier transform, then splitting the integral into high and low frequencies, and lastly using Plancharel's theorem, we get

$$
\|Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}}\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim r^3 \sup_{\{|\xi|<r\}} |(Q_1^{\text{even}} - Q_2^{\text{even}})\widehat{\ }(\xi)|^2 + r^{-2}.
$$

We proceed by imitating the argument from Section 4: apply (50) to the last inequality, insert the resulting inequaliting into (51), then select $\tau := r^{5/(2\lambda)}$, next select r such that

$$
r^{\frac{2\lambda+5}{2\lambda}} = c^{-1} \log \left\{ \left[1 + \left| \log(\delta \|\Lambda_{q_2}^1 - \Lambda_{q_1}^1\|_*) \right| \right]^{\lambda/4} \right\},
$$

drop higher-order terms (possibly at the cost of increasing the implicit constant), and thus derive the stability estimate of Theorem 3 with $\theta := \frac{\lambda}{2\lambda+5}$.

Acknowledgements. During the preparation of this paper P.C. was part of the University of Helsinki and was supported by the projects ERC-2010 Advanced Grant, 267700 - InvProb and Academy of Finland (Decision number 250215, the Centre of Excellence in Inverse Problems). K.M. is partly supported by the NSF. The authors would like to thank Gunther Uhlmann, who has vigorously facilitated this collaboration, and the organizers of the program on Inverse Problems held in Mittag-Leffler Institut in 2013, where this project was started.

References

[1] G. Alessandrini, Stable determination of conductivity by boundary measurements, Appl. Anal. 27 (1988), no. 1–3, 153–172.

[2] G. Alessandrini, K. Kim, Single-logarithmic stability for the Calderón problem with local data, J. Inv. Ill-Posed Problems 2012 , 20, 4, 389400.

[3] H. Ammari, G. Uhlmann, Reconstruction of the potential from partial Cauchy data for the Schrödinger equation, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **53** (2004), 169–183.

[4] H. Ben Joud, *A stability estimate for an inverse problem for the Schrödinger equation in a magnetic field from partial boundary measurements*, Inverse Problems **25** (2009), 045012.

[5] A. L. Bukhgeim and G. Uhlmann, Recovering a potential from partial Cauchy data, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **27** (2002), 653–668.

[6] P. Caro, P. Ola, and M. Salo, Inverse Boundary Value Problem for Maxwell Equations with Local Data. Communications in Partial Differential Equations **34**, 1425–1464 (2009).

[7] P. Caro, *On an inverse problem in electromagnetism with local data: stability and uniqueness*, *Inverse Probl. Imaging* **5** (2011), 297–322.
[8] P. Caro, D. Dos Santos Ferreira and A. Ruiz, Stability estimates for the Radon transform with restricted data and applications, Adv. Math. 267 (2014), 523–564.
[9] P. Caro, D. Dos Santos Ferreira and A. Ruiz, Stability estimates for the Calderón problem with partial data, preprint (2014), arXiv:1405.1217.
[10] P. Caro and M. Salo, Stability of the Calderón problem in admissible geometries. Accepted in Inverse Probl. Imaging, (2014).
[11] F. Chung, A Partial Data Result for the Magnetic Schrödinger Inverse Problem, Analysis & PDE **7**, (2014), 117–57.
[12] F. Chung, Partial Data for the Neumann-to-Dirichlet Map, preprint (2012), arXiv:1211.0211.
[13] F. Chung, M. Salo and L. Tzou, Partial data inverse problems for the Hodge Laplacian, preprint (2013), arXiv:1310.4616.
[14] F. Chung, Partial Data for the Neumann-Dirichlet Magnetic Schrdinger Inverse Problem, preprint (2014), arXiv:1402.4445.
[15] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, C. Kenig, J. Sjstrand and G. Uhlmann, Determining a magnetic Schrödinger operator from partial Cauchy data, Comm. Math. Phys., **271**, 467–488, 2007.
[16] I. K. Fathallah, Stability for the inverse potential problem by the local Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for the Schrdinger equation, Appl. Anal. 86 (2007), no. 7, 899914.
[17] G. Folland, Real analysis: modern techniques and applications, Second Edition, Wiley & Sons Inc., 1999.
[18] C. Guillarmou and L. Tzou, Calderón inverse problem with partial data on Riemann surfaces, Duke Math. J. **158** (2011), 83–120.
[19] H. Heck, G. Uhlmann and J.-N. Wang, Reconstruction of Obstacles Immersed in an Incompressible Fluid. Inverse Problems and Imaging 1 (2007), 63–76.
[20] H. Heck and J.-N. Wang, Stability estimates for the inverse boundary value problem by partial Cauchy data, Inverse Problems **22** (2006), 1787–1796.
[21] H. Heck and J.-N. Wang, Optimal stability estimate of the inverse boundary value problem by partial measurements, preprint (2007), arXiv:0708.3289.
[22] O. Y. Imanuvilov, G. Uhlmann and M. Yamamoto , The Calderón problem with partial data in two dimensions, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), 655–691.
[23] V. Isakov, *Inverse Source Problems*. Providence, Rhode Island: AMS 1990.
[24] V. Isakov, On uniqueness in the inverse conductivity problem with local data, Inverse Problems and Imaging **1** (2007), 95–105.
[25] C. Kenig and M. Salo, The Calderón problem with partial data on manifolds and applications, Analysis & PDE **6** (2013), 2003–2048.
[26] K. Krupchyk, M. Lassas, and G. Uhlmann, Inverse Problems With Partial Data for a Magnetic Schrödinger Operator in an Infinite Slab and on a Bounded Domain, Communications in Mathematical Physics **312** (2012), 87–126.
[27] C. E. Kenig, J. Sjöstrand, G. Uhlmann, The Calderón problem with partial data, Ann. of Math., 165 (2007), 567–691.
[28] X. Li and G. Uhlmann, Inverse problems with partial data in a slab, Inverse Problems and Imaging **4** (2010), 449–462.
[29] L. Liang, Increasing stability for the inverse problem of the Schrödinger equation with the partial Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. preprint (2014).
[30] N. Mandache, Exponential instability in an inverse problem for the Schrödinger equation, Inverse Problems 17 (2001), no. 5, 1435–1444.

[31] A. Nachman, B. Street, Reconstruction in the Calderón problem with partial data, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, Volume 35 (2010), No. 2, 375–390.
[32] K.-D, Phung, Remarques sur lobservabilité pour l'équation de Laplace. ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations **9** (2003), 621–35.
[33] V. Pohjola, An Inverse Problem for the Magnetic Schrödinger Operator on a Half Space with Partial Data, Inverse Problems and Imaging **8**, (2014) 1169–89.
[34] M. Salo and L. Tzou, Inverse problems with partial data for a Dirac system: a Carleman estimate approach. Adv. Math. **225** (2010), p. 487-513.
[35] L. Tzou, *Stability estimates for coefficients of the magnetic Schrödinger equation from full and partial boundary measurements*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **33** (2008), 1911–1952.

ICMAT - CSIC, Spain
E-mail address: pedro.caro@icmat.es

Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, USA
E-mail address: kmarinov@math.washington.edu